

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 and 91-101 currently remain in the application. Claim 1 has been amended for the purposes of clarification. Claims 91 and 101 have been amended without prejudice to further prosecution in a related application

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his time during the in-person interview of July 27, 2004. In the interview, the Itkis (4,856,787), Nakano (5,745,109) and Horvitz (5,880,733) were discussed. Applicant described using virtual camera in a 3-D gaming environment, such as positioning the virtual camera in the 3-D gaming environment to render a slot game including paylines and then display the slot game to the gaming machine. The Examiner agreed that language specifying virtual cameras to provide "captured" image to display to a user would distinguish over the prior art of record. Examiner stated that Itkis in view of Horvitz provides a 3-D interface to display game renderings, but does not provide for use of virtual cameras to render different game perspectives.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 17-18, 20-21, 25-26, 31-43, 45, 91-92, 94-98 and 100 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Itkis (US Patent No. 4,856,787) in view of Nakano et al. (US Patent No. 5,745, 109) in further view of Horvitz (US Patent No. 5,880, 733). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Itkis, Nakano and Horvitz does not teach all of the limitations of the present invention as recited in claims 1-7, 17-18, 20-21, 25-26, 31-43, 45 as amended.

The present invention describes a method applied on gaming machine capable of receiving wagers. The method comprises: 1) providing in the memory device on the gaming machine a three-dimensional geometrical description of a three-dimensional object in a three-dimensional gaming environment, 2) positioning under control of the master gaming a virtual camera controller in the three-dimensional gaming environment wherein at least portion of the three-dimensional gaming environment captured by the virtual camera is for rendering a slot game of chance that includes symbols displayed on a payline or a card game of chance that includes a display of a plurality of cards used in the card game of chance; and 3) rendering under control of the master gaming controller one or more two-dimensional images derived from the

three-dimensional object using the position of the virtual camera in the three-dimensional gaming environment stored in the memory device on the gaming machine.

The Examiner relies on Itkis to teach displaying a game of chance on a display screen of a gaming machine. Nakano describes a user interface that appears to be in 3-dimensions when displayed to a display screen. For instance, Nakano shows an interface that appears to the user as the inside of a box. Horvitz, like Nakano, describes another user interface that also provides a three dimensional perspective to the user when displayed.

One aspect of the present invention relates to methods of how the images displayed to a display screen are rendered inside of the gaming machine. In the present invention, a three-dimensional virtual "world" is modeled within the gaming machine and a virtual camera is positioned in the virtual "world" to render images that are displayed to a display screen on the gaming machine. These methods of the may be transparent to the user of the gaming machine. From a user perspective, the rendered images displayed on the gaming machine under the control of the master gaming controller may appear no different than images that are rendered using graphical techniques traditionally used on the casino-type gaming machines. The images generated with the present invention do not have to provide a 3-D perspective to the user as Nakano and Horvitz describe.

As is described in the specification of the present invention, the methods of 3-D real-time graphical rendering of the present invention offer many advantages to game designers. For example, for a multi-denominational slot game, the present invention allows for a large number of pre-rendered images that have to be generated and stored to display different credit amounts to be eliminated as compared to traditional graphical rendering methods. As another example, the look and feel of the graphics to the user may be enhanced with the present invention.

The combination of references cited by the Examiner describes the display from the user perspective but is relatively silent in regards to the graphical techniques used to generate the user interface. As pointed out in the response to previous office actions, Nakano does describe graphical rendering techniques that are used to generate their 3-D user interface that teach away from the present invention (e.g., the graphical images are pre-rendered in 2-D and not generated in real-time). Further, Examiner has stated that these references do not teach the use of "virtual" cameras. In addition, the references do not teach or suggest any motivation for performing the modifications suggested by the Examiner. For instance, Itkis only describes simple 2-D graphics and Nakano and Horvitz make no mention of wagering type gaming machines.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Nakano and Itkis can't be said to render obvious the claims 1-7, 17-18, 20-21, 25-26, 31-43 and 45 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Itkis (US Patent No.4,856,787) in view of Nakano et al. (US Patent No.5,745, 109) in view of

Horvitz (US Patent No. 5,880, 733) and in further view of Paige (5,941,722). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Paige teaches advertising associated with a gaming machine. The teachings of Paige do not overcome the deficiencies associated with the combination of Itkis, Nakano and Horvitz. Further, Applicant believes there is not any motivation for the combination. Paige teaches drawing logos on mechanical slot reels. Applicant respectfully asks: *Where in the references is any motivation provided to render promotions, advertising or casino information in a 3-D gaming environment in the manner described in the pending claims?* Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Nakano, Itkis, Horvitz and Paige can't be said to render obvious the claims 8-10 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 49, 99 and 101 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Itkis (US Patent No.4,856,787) in view of Nakano et al. (US Patent No.5,745, 109), in view of Horvitz and in further view of Luciano, Jr et al. (6, 050, 895). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Examiner states Luciano teaches providing players with a bonus game. Luciano does not teach or suggest virtual cameras and in particular rendering of an attract mode, a promotional feature or casino information is not described. The teachings of Luciano do not overcome the deficiencies associated with the combination of Itkis, Nakano and Horvitz. Further, Applicant believes there is not any motivation for the combination. Applicant respectfully asks: *Where in the references is any motivation provided to render bonus games in a 3-D gaming environment as described in the pending claims?* Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Nakano, Itkis, Horvitz and Luciano can't be said to render obvious the claims 11 and 49 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 12-16, 29, 93 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Itkis (US Patent No.4,856,787) in view of Nakano et al. (US Patent No.5,745, 109), in view of Horvitz and in further view of O'Neill. (5, 621, 906). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Examiner relies on O'Neill to teach the changing of position of objects via a user input to a user interface. The present invention is not so limited in that it does not require a user to input data into a user interface to reposition objects. Further, O'Neill does not describe virtual cameras and their control by a master gaming controller. Thus, the teachings of O'Neill do not overcome the deficiencies associated with the combination of Itkis, Nakano and Horvitz. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Nakano, Itkis and Horvitz and O'Neill can't be said to render obvious the claims 12-16 and 29 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 19, 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Itkis (US Patent No.4, 856,787) in view of Nakano et al. (US Patent No.5, 745, 109) in view of Horvitz and in further view of Sitrick (4, 572, 509). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sitrick does not teach 3-D graphical rendering. Thus, the teachings of Sitrick do not overcome the deficiencies associated with the combination of Itkis, Nakano and Horvitz. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Nakano, Itkis, Horvitz and Sitrick can't be said to render obvious the claims 19, 22-23 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Itkis (US Patent No.4, 856,787) in view of Nakano et al. (US Patent No.5, 745, 109) in view of Horvitz in further view of Sitrick (4, 572, 509) and in further view of Luciano. The rejection is respectfully traversed.


Sitrick and Luciano do not teach 3-D graphical rendering. Thus, the teachings of Sitrick and Luciano do not overcome the deficiencies associated with the combination of Itkis, Nakano. And Horvitz Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Nakano, Itkis, Horvitz, Sitrick and Luciano can't be said to render obvious the claims 24 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 27-28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Itkis (US Patent No.4, 856,787) in view of Nakano et al. (US Patent No.5, 745, 109) in view of Horvitz and in further view of Karmarkar (6,508, 709). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Karmarkar do not teach 3-D graphical rendering. Thus, the teachings of Karmarkar do not overcome the deficiencies associated with the combination of Itkis, Nakano and Horvitz. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Nakano, Itkis, Horvitz and Karmarkar can't be said to render obvious the claims 27-28 and 30 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


David P. Olynick
Reg. No.: 48,615

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
510-843-6200

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.